

Application No. 09/694,965

**REMARKS**

In the most recent Office Action, claims 1, 4-8, 10-11, and 14-16 have been rejected as anticipated by Yamada. In particular, claim 1, from which all of the other claims in this rejection are dependent, includes a limitation, "the machine carrying out one preselected course of action of a plurality of selectable courses of action if the code required for using the function is not entered, one selectable course of action including the machine holding image data," which is anticipated by column 7, lines 4-7 of Yamada.

In the above amendment to claim 1, it is now further recited that the image data is retained in a memory for a predetermined time, until a code required for using the function is entered. These limitations have been taken from claims 5 and 6 as originally filed, subsequently amended, and here cancelled. In the rejection, claims 5 and 6 were similarly rejected as anticipated by same passage in Yamada as was claim 1.

This is the cited portion of Yamada, with additional sentences provided for context, and emphasis added:

In the example shown in FIG. 7, a circle-in-square key indicates that printing by the external equipment is allowed even if the management key and card are not inserted and the password number is not entered. A cross-in-square key indicates that the local copy operation is **inhibited** if the management key is not inserted, irrespective of the color mode. Even if the card is not entered, a monochrome copy is permitted. If the management key is inserted, the monochrome copy is permitted and a single color copy other than black (e.g., magenta, cyan, yellow, red, blue, green, etc.) is permitted even if the password number is entered. The full color copy is permitted only if all the use restriction means (key, card, and password number) are satisfied.

The above passage does not anticipate the language of the limitation in claim 1. As far as can be determined, if the desired printing operation is not permitted by use of the "management key," it simply is "inhibited"— prevented

Application No. 09/694,965

from happening. Nowhere in the passage is it stated that image data is *held* in the machine, as in claim 1.

What is recited in claim 1, "holding the job," is more substantive than merely preventing the job from happening, as supported in the Specification as filed in pages 6-7 (emphases added):

In the case of the "hold job" option, if a particular function is requested without at least one of the required codes being entered, the image data relating to the job can nonetheless be **retained in a memory at the particular machine selected for use**. This image data can be retained in the machine in any number of forms: in the case of printing, the image data can be retained its basic PDL format, such as in PCL or Adobe® PostScript™, or alternately can be decomposed by the printer and held in an uncompressed or lightly compressed form **for essentially immediate submission to printing hardware once the necessary codes are entered**.

With the "hold job" option, provision is made (such as in further windows, not shown) for allowing the administrator to specify how long data is retained at a particular machine in expectation of receiving all of the required billing codes.

Under the claimed invention, as supported by the corresponding language ("hold job") in the Specification, when a requested job is not authorized at the time of submission, the image data is nonetheless retained in a memory (such as in the machine) until the job is subsequently authorized. (As mentioned in previous Remarks, in the scanning or facsimile context, image data that is collected from a hard-copy original can also be held, i.e., retained but not sent outward, at a machine. Other dependent claims have been modified to be formally consistent with the changes in claim 1.) The Yamada reference is silent as to what, if anything, happens to image data when a print request is denied. Absent a disclosure of holding the job as in claim 1, Yamada cannot be cited to anticipate the invention of claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 9, and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 over Yamada in view of Cook.

Application No. 09/694,965

Yamada has been distinguished above with regard to claim 1, from which all of the claims in this rejection are dependent. The secondary reference, Cook, is cited for showing displaying a request for a type of code to perform a function, and then carrying out a preselected course of action if the code is not entered. However, the overall context of Cook is an online security/authorization system for debiting money from prepaid phone cards. It is not suggested in Cook that the general security functions have any relevance to printers, or, more specifically, to handling *image data* that would be sent to a printer or to or from a MFP.

The claims are therefore in condition for allowance.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment; however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Application No. 09/694,965

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-3811, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Hutter  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 32,418  
Telephone (585) 423-3811

January 18, 2005  
RH/fsl  
Xerox Corporation  
Xerox Square 20A  
Rochester, New York 14644